Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 91-216
H. R. 13008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 13008. 1
Digest of Public Law 91-216. 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 13008

July 22, 1969	Rep. Hanley introduced and discussed H. R. 13008 which was referred to House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Print of bill and remarks of author.
Jan. 28, 1970	House subcommittee approved H. R. 13008.
Jan. 29, 1970	House committee voted to report H. R. 13008.
Feb. 3, 1970	House committee reported H. R. 13008 with amendments. H. Report No. 91-823. Print of bill and report.
Feb. 16, 1970	House passed H. R. 13008 under suspension of the rules.
Feb. 17, 1970	H. R. 13008 was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Mar. 2, 1970	Senate committee reported H. R. 13008 without amendment. S. Report No. 91-713. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 4, 1970	Senate passed H. R. 13008 without amendment.
Mar. 17, 1970	Approved: Public Law 91-216.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 13008

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 22, 1969

Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MESKILL) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

A BILL

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1969".

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the

country's needs during the past several decades has led to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no

significant study of, or experimentation with, the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission

shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commission, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and which shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include, among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commission shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use and administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall consult with the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives on a periodic basis as requested by those committees.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with, and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 13008

A BILL

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HANLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MESKILL

JULY 22, 1969
Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

So our distinguished Secretary of Defense constructs a thermonuclear strawman—Soviet first-strike capability. Therefore, we must tie arms talks to alleged political considerations and concessions in Asia and the Middle East.

I do not pretend to read the administration's mind or question motives of our Secretary of Defense. Yet it seems obvious that with arms talks stalled, temptation to covertly proceed with ABM and MIRV might be irresistible. Congress has been stampeded before into approving full funding of a system which is either useless or a futile escalation of the arms race.

Effective control of new weapons is essential in their early stages or it is impossible to keep them in check. Further steps down the arms race road will bring us to a point of no return. If we place useless super weapons development before peace talks, we will have taken the wrong turn down a path of no return—it is a blind alley of annihilation.

Brinkmanship is outdated. It only frightens America and calls forth negative reactions. Rousseau stated that common interest matters less to players and actors than peculiar advantages for which they aim. Our game's goals must be changed in favor of disarmament. Look at what has already been accomplished on the fringes of disarmament by Democratic administrations willing to work toward this goal. The list of their achievements is impressive, indeed.

First, total disarmament achieved in Antarctica;

Second, testing of nuclear weapons has been banned in several environments;

Third, risk of atmospheric contamination has been halted;

Fourth, outer space has been ruled out for nuclear weapons;

Fifth, Latin America has been ruled out for nuclear weapons;

Sixth, a curb has been placed on proliferation of nuclear weapons through the nonproliferation treaty;

Seventh, work has been started on securing another environment—the seabed—from encroachment by weapons of mass destruction;

Eighth, we have offered to move toward regional arms control in Europe; and

Ninth, to insure and verify integrity of arms control agreements, we have developed an elaborate and effective system of detection, inspection, and surveillance.

It is vain for us to continue to rattle thermonuclear sabres at one another. Daily, more Americans rise against past follies and future menaces. Our political approach must be as mature as our technology. Perhaps Communist intransigence will foil our best attempts, but we must try. We simply must. If we move immediately to open Geneva negotiations with the Soviets, I am certain they will meet us half way. Disarmament now, before it is too late. Another alternative is unthinkable. I know Mr. Nixon is a sincere lover of peace and pray fervently that he will take up this initiative.

NERVE GAS OVERSEAS: PULLING DEATH'S WHISKERS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is damningly obvious that there has been an accident on the island of Okinawa involving a deadly nerve gas known as VX. Twenty-five American military personnel have been hospitalized. It is also obvious to us as a result of this occurrence that U.S. Armed Forces have been stockpiling such substances and weapons on Okinawa, our major advanced base in that area of the world. It is within our realm of logic to conclude that other facilities similar to Okinawa in importance are now serving as storage areas and stockpile facilities for this and similar deadly substances.

If this is the case, Congress has no information regarding it. If this has been done, it ranks with the recently revealed secret treaty with Thailand as a major violation of the congressional prerogatives to control such acts and commitments. In their wisdom, the people who founded this Nation made provision for a system of checks and balances, insuring that one branch of Government would always keep close watch on activities of her branches. At no time has this process been more essential than now. Yet we seem to be receiving masses of evermore incontrovertible evidence that congressional authority over such activities and commitments is decreasing rather than increasing.

Again and again revelations surface of acts measurably detrimental to major long-range interests of our Nation. All such acts are results of commitments made illegally and in violation of constitutionally defined and guaranteeed rights of Congress.

Secret agreements with Franco. Commitment of American troops to maneuvers in tandem with Spanish troops in a highly questionable exercise. A secret treaty with Thailand making significant American military and political guarantees without advice or consent of the Senate. Now we have lighted a flaring bonfire of anti-American indignation in Japan, fueling arguments of America's bitterest opponents because of the nerve gas incident on Okinawa.

Nerve gas is an offensive weapon. Why, by any stretch of imagination, is it being stockpiled on a forward major offensive base? Surely it could not have been scheduled for use in Vietnam. It is my understanding that our Nation is pledged to a policy of abstention regarding use of such agents, following policies laid down by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Is the Pentagon in the process of changing its mind in regard to this policy? Does Congress not have a right to be informed of such a proposed change? Shall we not have an opportunity to debate whys and wherefores of such a far-reaching, contemplated move?

We now have the dawning realization of significant deployment of nerve gas to major American bases without consultation or informing of the Congress. The same is true of allies intimately involved in such moves and exposed to their automatically attendant consequences. It is obvious that Japan was told nothing about such a deployment or presence. Gas involved in this case is the same agent responsible for the major Utah sheep kill.

Mr. Speaker, nerve gas can have nothing whatsoever to do with defense of bases in forward areas. We can only conclude that they are there for possible offensive purposes. It seems, therefore, that a departure from F.D.R.'s theorem is not only contemplated, but can today be called a fait accompli. The Pentagon, of course, says nothing, which tells us much.

Logic leads us to still other questions. Who has access to such menacing materials? Are others being trained in their use? By whom and where? It is publicly claimed that small quantities of nerve gas are being shipped by us to West Germany. Is this not a violation of the 1954 West European Union Protocol? We are also told that high-ranking officers from Spain and Nationalist China have toured our CBW facilities. Why? Especially Franco's Spain. Since when does his military establishment rate such treatment and access to such highly classified information?

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one of the most horrifying death-dealing products of man's mind. CBW is in danger of getting out of hand completely. On all sides we have suddenly discovered what is being done with such weapons in the name of national defense. All these acts cumulatively are gross violations of the spirit and strict rules of our Constitution. Such acts are positively forbidden under basic documents governing our Nation. Are we going to allow a military ethic to attain and preserve a momentum all its own which now carries so far as to result in these revelations?

If any military establishment is allowed to develop, experiment, and deploy such agents, who will actually prevent them from being used? If we have failed to prevent deployment at forward major combat bases, who shall dare say we have actual control over them at any time?

Our military have taken it upon themselves, in the sacred name of patriotism, to take steps which remove them from strict supervision by the civilian branch of Government. They are in danger of becoming a law unto themselves. We must reach out a strong constitutional hand immediately and rein these well-meaning gentlemen in before someone makes a mistake that will kill thousands of Americans here or abroad, or commits some unspeakable atrocity overseas. Or even worse, before we blunder into a major conflict. Minimally our alliance with Japan has been placed in further jeopardy because of this latest incident. Stupidity and possible deliberate avoidance of civilian control today

threatens the linchpin of our Asian alliance.

A basic constitutional question is before us, fraught with geopolitical and military consequences.

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1969

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will begin the process of major revisions of the position classification systems of the Federal Government.

In January of this year, my Subcommittee on Position Classification issued its "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government." The result of a year of comprehensive study, the report outlined a series of findings and recommendations concerning both the concepts behind and the administration of position classification in the Federal Government. That report is the basis of the bill which has been introduced today.

Position classification is one of the keystones of modern personnel management. Simply stated, the concept behind position classification is that it is the position, or the job, which should be classified and ranked rather than the individual holding that job. Ideally, the process by which the duties and responsibilities of a position are determined, and the position is thereby assigned a relative value, should have an important role in such diverse functions as budgeting, manpower allocation, determination of recruitement and training needs, performance evaluation, and many others. Unfortunately, during the course of the study, we found that often the position classification programs of the various departments and agencies were being used almost exclusively as a pay-setting device and little else.

There are many reasons for this failure to use position classification to the fullest extent possible. As pointed out in our report, much can be done to improve the administration of classification systems in the various departments and agencies. Classifiers should be better trained. They should be more knowledgeable about the program needs of their agencies and should make greater efforts to act as a technical adviser to line management rather than as an isolated professional using jargon and procedures imcomprehensible to all but the personnel management fraternity. Greater efforts should be made to insure consistency in classification within and among agencies. Attempts need to be made to simplify what is now an overwhelmingly complex general schedule system to make classification more understandable to managers and employees.

These, and many other things, need to be done. However, they lie within the realm of administrative reform and hence do not readily lend themselves to legislation. We in Congress must do all we can, however, to encourage the Civil Service Commission and the other departments and agencies to institute needed administrative reforms and to change archaic and outdated attitudes toward classification in particular and personnel management in general.

My bill is designed to be a catalyst in the two areas which I feel are most in need of reform.

The general schedule classification system, under the general control of the Civil Service Commission, is predicated on the assumption that all positions in the Federal Government can and should be classified substantially under one method: narrative standards and guidelines. As a result, the Commission has developed a series of standards which are bewildering in their complexity and overwhelming in sheer volume. The basic principles underlying the use of these standards have remained virtually unchanged since the passage of the first Classification Act in 1923.

The reasoning behind this rigid adherence to one method is understandable. The Commission is the apex of a classification system which covers almost 2 million employees and thousands of different occupations. It would be natural to wish that one approach be adequate for all, if for no other reason than to reduce the intellectual strain incumbent in using several different methods to achieve a common goal.

As modern government has grown in the past 40 years, as it has become more intimately involved with the social, economic, and scientific structure of our country, the demands on position classification systems have grown proportionately. Countless occupations which did not exist 40 years ago have been pressed into the general schedule classification system which was originally designed for jobs which were comparatively easy to categorize in 1923. And, with the content, nature, and relative value of many occupations changing almost daily, serious doubt has arisen as to whether one method alone is adequate to maintain the flexibility necessary to keep classifications current. Conversely, it is also questionable whether complex narrative standards are really necessary for a large number of easily categorized positions, such as those in the clerical fields.

The sin on the part of the Commission, then, is one of omission rather than commission. What it has done, it has generally done well. But the Commission has failed to experiment with and adopt the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which best suit the needs of the various departments and agencies and occupational groups.

This relatively narrow approach is rather like creating an orchestra with nothing but violins. The sound might be good; the musicians could be the finest in the world. However, no matter how competent the violinists might be in imitating the sounds of the missing instruments, they could not achieve strength and versatility of a full orchestra. Just as the incorporation of additional instruments can enhance the total sound of an orchestra, so the use of various methods of job evaluation and ranking can be orchestrated by the Civil Service Commission to achieve equal treatment among positions throughout the executive branch while at the same time encouraging much-needed flexibility in administration.

This brings us to a second major problem area pin-pointed by our report. The Classification Act of 1949 contained more than 20 exemptions from its provisions. Since that time, other exemptions have been added. Thus we now have large and small blocks of positions which are classified under unrelated systems. The Postal Field Service uses one approach; the Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Agency, Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration all have their own programs; and the Foreign Service uses yet another approach. Most of these separate systems were created because the general schedule system did not meet their needs; and most of them are competently administered. Yet, to quote our report:

> The number and variety of classification and ranking systems in the Federal service create confusion and result in differences in the methods of selection and appointment, promotion, conditions of work, and pay of employees in comparable conditions.

With these two problems in mind, we can then move on to the major purposes of the bill which I have introduced. I feel that all civilian, white-collar positions in the executive branch should be placed under a single classification plan under the general control and supervision of the Civil Service Commission. However, the integration of the several separate systems under a single "umbrella" would serve no useful purpose if the general schedule system remains unchanged. Thus, I also feel that the proposed plan should utilize as many job evaluation and ranking methods as appropriate. The primary change, and it is a major one, would be that under the proposal there would be one agency, the Civil Service Commission, responsible for establishing a common set of values for the classification of all positions and supervising the use of the various methods of position classification within and among all departments and agencies toward the end of consistent treatment of various occupational groups throughout the Government.

The bill is divided into three titles. Title I outlines some of the major findings of the "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government."

Title II declares that the executive branch should operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, utilizing such methods as may be appropriate, under the general supervision and control of the Civil Service Commission.

Title III establishes the mechanism by which proposals for placing the above principles into effect will be prepared and presented to Congress for action. A unit is to be established within the Civil Service Commission which shall report directly to the Commissioners. This office will be responsible for preparing a plan for the establishment of a co-

ordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for all civilian positions. The Commission is given the authority, which it does not now have, to investigate all systems. The title directs that the Commission submit an interim report within 1 year of enactment, and that the study be completed and legislative proposals be submitted to the Congress within 2 years after the date of enactment. It also provides for periodic consultation with the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees and with appropriate employee organizations.

This bill does not represent the final answer to the many problems outlined in the report. However, it does represent an essential first step. Our subcommittee plans to follow carefully the progress of the Commission's study on a day-by-day basis. I am sure that we can all work together fruitfully to bring about the reforms in position classification which are necessary for personnel management in the Federal Government to meet the demands of hte future.

As mentioned in the report, it would be incorrect to say that we are at the crisis stage. The classification systems, as they stand now, have worked moderately well, and valiant efforts have been made by the Civil Service Commission and the departments and agencies to improve the administration of the various systems.

However, as the complexity of modern Government increases, the inadequacies of the present systems will be magnified until a crisis does exist. The time to begin to change is now while we still have the latitude and breathing space to carefully consider reform.

Changing job evaluation or ranking systems is a delicate and time-consuming job. It raises many questions and doubts in the minds of employees subject to the systems. It breaks patterns of thought and action with which personnel officials have become comfortable—perhaps too comfortable—over the past 45 years. Perhaps several years will be necessary to fully implement the recommendations contained in the report and the program outlined in my bill. However, if adopted, these recommendations should result in greater equity to employees throughout the Federal service, assurance of more consistency in the evaluation and ranking of positions, and the foundation for a system which will be more readily adaptable to the changing needs of the Government in the years to come.

ROBERT D. BYRNES

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of July 21, 1969, bore the news of the death of Robert D. Byrnes.

For nearly a quarter of a century Bob Byrnes was the Washington bureau chief of the Hartford Courant and in that period he rendered outstanding service to his newspaper and to the people of the State of Connecticut.

There was no newspaperman in Washington who was more painstaking or who knew his job and the sources of news better than did Bob Byrnes. A political editor of the Courant, Bob came to Washington in 1943 and from that time until his retirement at the end of 1967 he performed the difficult, important, and exacting task of finding and distilling national news for the people of Hartford and the State of Connecticut at large.

Bob's forte was thoroughness and Members of Congress were often surprised to find how quickly he learned of a news story or how closely he followed their activities on the floor or in committee. Members sometimes felt that his coverage was too close as when he reported their positions on unrecorded teller votes, but the people of Connecticut never had to complain about lack of information from Bob.

So long as he was at his job, the State could rest secure that virtue would be rewarded, scullduggery revealed, and fairness prevail on the Washington news front for newspaper readers of the Nutmeg State.

At Bob's resignation a reception was held in the Senate wing of the Capitol and his many Capitol Hill friends joined in presenting him with a silver cigarette box as a token of their affection and esteem. I was honored to have had the privilege of presenting that box to Bob on behalf of all his friends and I am honored today to pay this tribute to Robert D. Byrnes, a dedicated and able commentator on the Washington scene.

We regret his death but we are grateful for his contribution to Connecticut journalism and to American public life.

AN ACT OF REALISM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President of the United States on his courage and boldness in scheduling a visit to the Communist State of Rumania.

What the President has done is simply to place the Eastern Communist world on notice that the United States will move toward friendship, step for step, with those who wish to move toward friendship with us. It places the Western World on notice that the United States has recognized the cracks in the Communist monolith and we intend to pursue these developments in the interests of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and in the interests of peace.

The President is and has always been a realist toward the Communist world. He rejects the naive assumptions of past policy that, by throwing away economic concessions, we will win political gains. He deals with the nations of Eastern Europe as an American head of state should deal with them—recognizing that they have interests and we have interests and we do not intend to give up something for nothing. If they seek trade advantages in the United States, we will hold those out, but there are political and diplomatic dividends which we seek in Eastern Europe—and we welcome a horse trade. There will be no something-for-nothing deals with the Communist world with President Nixon in the White House.

The President has been criticized for not clearing his visit with the Soviet Union. It is not the custom of American Presidents, certainly it is not the practice of this one, to clear our diplomatic moves in advance with Moscow. They have never cleared theirs with us. Indeed, if we are to take Foreign Minister Gromyko at his word, the visit to Bucharest is not seen by them as a provocative act.

I am encouraged by the fact that we have in President Nixon a Chief Executive who initiates moves in foreign policy rather than simply reacting to them. It is good to have a dynamic foreign policy for the United States rather than a static one. The President takes with him on this first visit into Eastern Europe and the Communist world by an American President our hopes that he can bring back some sign of a more just and enduring peace. He should be commended by the American people for making this historic effort.

ONE SMALL STEP FOR MAN

(Mr. CASEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, few men in history have been so privileged as we to be eyewitnesses at the birth of a new era.

The magnificent and incredible voyage of Apollo XI has brought to all mankind a keen sense of participation in our greatest moment in history. Now, this journey nears an end, as the skillful hands of our three valiant astronauts guide their spacecraft safely home.

To these men, Neil Armstrong, Edwin—Buzz—Aldrin, and Michael Collins, our humble congratulations for a superb job well done. If, indeed, our destiny lies among the stars—then you have placed us on the threshold and turned a brilliant guiding light upon the path. Experts claim that the footprints you have placed upon the lunar dust will last a half million years. But I say that these shall fade forever before the memory of your magnificent achievement shall be forgotten by mankind.

To the thousands of hard-working men and women of NASA and the aerospace industry, whose dedication and ability made this lunar landing and ascent a flawless performance, goes the grateful thanks of all our people.

It was my great privilege to be with you at the Manned Spacecraft Center during this most critical phase of the lunar landing, and to share with you the tense moments when the whole world watched and listened in awe. You are the unsung heroes—the very backbone of our efforts to send men among the stars, and safely bring them home. No words of mine can add to the luster of your accomplishments, nor increase the great and justifiable pride you can take in the job you have done. But on behalf of your friends and neighbors in our 22d District, and indeed for all your fellow citizens, I express our grateful and heartfelt thanks for your magnificent achievements. You built and placed the boots

upon the feet of the first man to step upon the Moon—you made the "giant leap for all mankind" possible.

Few moments during the long and tortuous vigil we kept, Mr. Speaker, were more heartwarming than those in which the television newsmen interviewed the loved ones these great astronauts left behind. To Mrs. Janet Armstrong, Mrs. Patricia Collins, Mrs. Joan Aldrin, their youngsters and parents, goes a special thanks for the patience and understanding they showed to a world eager for details on this incredible journey and the men who were making it. The wonderful confidence they expressed was reassuring to us all, and they know, I am sure, that millions of us around the world joined with them in prayer for the safety of these three valiant men.

Last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, I think a special word of thanks goes to every American, whose hard-earned tax dollars made this program and this journey possible. Each of us bought a portion of Apollo XI, of Columbia and Eagle, and the hardware which safety required be left upon the lunar surface. While history will not record our part in this tremendous undertaking, each of us can take pride in knowing that without our support, both moral and financial, this journey would never have been made. Each of us can take pride in knowing that we made possible mankind's finest hour. I watched with keen interest many of the interviews of the "man in the street" and his reaction to this great adventure. As one who has long supported our fullest participation and funding of this great space program, it was heartwarming to see that our citizens by far expressed full support for our efforts and indeed, urged that we continue our great efforts in space.

Millions of words shall be written through the years on this epic adventure, Mr. Speaker, but none shall be so important as those written by this Congress in the coming weeks. For upon our shoulders rests the heavy responsibility of being the architects of man's future in space, in guiding the programs in our quest for knowledge, and providing the funds to make them possible. We have gathered under NASA a brilliant and highly competent team that has put us first in space and opened the door of the future. We now stand in danger of succumbing to the siren call of false economy, of being niggardly in our support and permitting the erosion and disintegration of this program and the dispersal of the men and women who made it possible. To permit this to happen is to break faith with the men of Apollo XI and unborn generations for whom we have opened wide the door to knowledge of man's universe. We have both the resources and the ability to attack and resolve our problems here at home and our commitments abroad, and still move forward swiftly in this vital program to roll back the frontiers of space. No higher priority can be given to any program than one which furthers mankind's undying quest for knowledge. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will agree and join with me in full support of this vital program and in seeing that it moves forward swiftly.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 22d District of Texas—home of NASA's great Manned Spacecraft Center—I extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to our three great friends and neighbors: Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Mike Collins. Your incredible journey has inspired all mankind and will live forever in the pages of history. You have given us our finest hour, and the great pride we have at being a witness to such a magnificent event shall live with us forever.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of illness in the family.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of official business.

Mr. KLEPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 24 through July 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on July 24.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN, to revise and extend his remarks immediately following the remarks heretofore made.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FOREMAN and to include extraneous material during his remarks of today on H.R. 12781, while in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. AYRES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. BRASCO in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. FARBSTEIN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. RIVERS.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 18, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7215. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversatry of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

981. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the budget for fiscal year

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Jan. 28, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 9

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,8,12
Area redevelopment.....28
Asst. Secretary.....18
Budget.....27
Buildings.....32
Committee employees.....5
Conservation.....10
Cotton.....21
Egg inspection.....6
Employment.....25
Environment.....13,14,23
Erosion.....34
Farm labor.....11
Farm program.....21,31
Feed grains.....20
Food-aid.....3
Food stamps.....31
Foreign affairs.....18
Foreign aid.....8
Foreign trade.....16
Forests.....10,19
Grazing fees.....4,15
Grapes.....11
Hunger.....3,36
Inflation.....9,12,27
Labeling.....26
Nutrition.....36
Packaging.....26
Personnel.....2,30
Pesticides.....29
Population.....17
Property.....22
Quarantine station.....7
Research.....23,24
River basins.....35
Taxation.....19
Textiles.....16
Timber.....19
Transportation.....33
Veto message.....1,12
Wilderness.....10

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported egg products inspection bill and bill to establish international quarantine station. Rep. Findley urged this Department to withdraw opposition to Texas food-aid court order. Rep. Abernethy introduced and discussed cotton bill. House sustained veto of Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS; VETO MESSAGE. Sustained, 226 to 191, the President's veto of H. R. 13111, making appropriations for Labor-HEW for fiscal year 1970. pp. H391-458

2. PERSONNEL. The Civil Service subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 13008, amended, the proposed Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1969. p. D36

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3. FOOD-AID; HUNGER. Rep. Findley stated this Department "should withdraw its opposition to a court order requiring that Federal food-aid programs for poor families be established immediately in 88 Texas counties." pp. H472-4
Rep. Schwengel praised the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the walk for development program. pp. H459-71

4. GRAZING FEES. Rep. Saylor criticized the "grazing fee moratorium decision", stated "It is time the public's voice was heard" and inserted comments on this subject. pp. H474-8

5. COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES. Received list of committee employees showing salaries for the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969. pp. H481-90

SENATE

6. EGG INSPECTION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2116, to provide for inspection of certain egg products (S. Rept. 91-639) p. S726

7. QUARANTINE STATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2306, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station (S. Rept. 91-638). p. S726

8. APPROPRIATIONS; FOREIGN AID. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 15149, fiscal 1970 appropriations for the foreign aid program. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S764-770

9. INFLATION. Sen. Hansen criticized economist Gardner Ackley, remarking that Ackley criticism of the HEW veto was evidence "that the absence of Democratic Party economists from the Government is having a positively beneficial effect." p. S725

10. CONSERVATION; WILDERNESS: FORESTS. Sen. Yarborough inserted a Southwestern Association of Naturalists resolution endorsing the creation of the Big Thicket National Park. p. S735

11. GRAPES; FARM LABOR. Sen. Kennedy inserted an article which records the success of the United Farm Workers organization in securing union benefits for farmworkers in the grape-growing areas. pp. S736-8

12. VETO MESSAGE; APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Hartke criticized the Labor-HEW veto message, arguing that "Congress, by reducing President Nixon's spending requests by $5.6 billion and by redistributing some of this spending to domestic needs, demonstrated its commitment to reordering our national priorities and to fighting inflation." p. S739

13. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Murphy inserted Interior Asst. Secretary Smith's address which offers the view that "Nature is never static nor is a totally natural environment always the most suitable for civilization. Our Challenge is to maintain the delicate balance between man and nature...and shape our environment in such a manner as to leave a better quality of living to future generations." pp. S752-3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

14. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Church stated that one of the greatest problems which we are currently facing is that of cleaning up our environment. pp. E424-5

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Jan. 29, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 10

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9
Appropriations.....4,8,19
Census.....6
Child nutrition.....10
Cigarette labeling.....1
Consumers.....26
Credit unions.....13
Education.....16,18
Environment.....11,18,24
Farm labor.....2
Farm program.....5
Feed grains.....14
Fish farming.....23
Foreign aid.....4
Forests.....8
Fur seals.....20
Grazing fees.....21
Housing.....19
Inflation.....7
Interest rates.....12
Land use.....15
Legislative program.....8
Peanuts.....22
Personnel.....3
Pesticides.....25
Pollution.....11,18,24
Poultry.....26
Property.....17
School lunch.....10

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported school lunch and child nutrition bill. Rep. Sisk criticized administration's alleged failure to submit farm legislation proposals. Sen. Mondale and Rep. Culver introduced and discussed bills to provide advance feed grain payments to producers. Sen. Jackson introduced and discussed national land use policy bill.

HOUSE

1. CIGARETTE LABELING. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 6543, to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking. p. H493 Senate conferees have not been appointed.

2. FARM LABOR. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 14733, to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers. p. H493 Senate conferees have not been appointed.

3. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 13008, the proposed Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1969. p. D43

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

4. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Gross inserted his telegram to the President asking that he veto the foreign aid appropriation bill. p. H493

5. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Sisk commended Secretary Hardin for a "most cooperative attitude" in attempting to work out some of the problems concerning American agriculture, and stated that "we have not been able to get from the administration a definitive statement of its policies, spelled out in legislative language", and reminded this Department "that the time has come to fish or cut bait in connection with agricultural legislation." p. H544

6. CENSUS. Rep. Charles Wilson inserted a summary description of the new procedures developed by the Bureau of the Census in efforts to ensure a more complete and accurate census. pp. H538-41

7. INFLATION. Rep. Albert asked that the President act promptly to halt inflationary trends. p. H542

Rep. Bevill suggested that a veto of the foreign aid appropriation bill would initiate a fight against inflation. p. H542

Rep. Reuss and others discussed the progress to date of the administration's war on inflation. pp. H545-8

Rep. Patman criticized "misguided monetary policies" of the Federal Reserve System. pp. H550-1

8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on next Mon., Feb. 2, a continuing appropriation resolution will be considered, and that the high-timber yield bill will be considered on Wed. Reps. Mahon, Ford, Albert and others discussed the new Labor-HEW bill and the language to be used in the continuing resolution. pp. H536-8

9. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 2. p. H538

SENATE

10. SCHOOL LUNCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with an amendment S. 2548, to amend the School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act (S. Rept. 91-641) p. S834

11. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Pell inserted U. S. Commissioner of Education Allen's address, "Education for Survival", which proposes "EEE---environmental/ecological education---at every level of learning." pp. S849-51

Sen. Percy commended and inserted the essay of a high school senior on the subject of pollution and the environment of man. pp. S854-5

12. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Gore noted that the new interest rates on certain U. S. securities is enticing saving deposits from small banks, thereby reducing the amount of available local loan money. pp. S853-4

13. CREDIT UNIONS. Sen. Saxbe spoke in favor of legislation to provide for an independent agency to supervise federally chartered credit unions. pp. S856-7

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Feb. 3, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 13

CONTENTS

Airports.....12
Appropriations.....11
Budget.....7,20
Economic report.....8
Environment.....14,25,28
Farm labor.....16
Forests.....9,22
Grazing fees.....15
Hunger.....18,19
Indians.....5
Lands.....2
Loans.....5
Marketing orders.....1
Orange juice.....21
Peace Corps.....10
Personnel.....4,17,23
Pesticides.....26
Population.....3
Pollution....7,14,25,27,28
Potatoes.....1
Poultry.....24
Property.....29
Public works.....13
Recreation.....2
Research center.....29
School lunch.....21
Taxation.....27
Timber yield.....9
Weather.....6

HIGHLIGHTS; House Rules Committee cleared bills to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders, and to authorize production research under marketing orders. Rep. Sullivan opposed proposed change in poultry inspection regulations dealing with diseased chickens. Rep. Burke, Fla., favored use of frozen orange juice in school lunch program.

HOUSE

1. POTATOES; MARKETING AGREEMENTS. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for the consideration of S. 2214, to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders; and H. R. 14810, to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs. p. H616

2. RECREATION; LANDS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3786, to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the acquisition of land at Point Reyes National Seashore. p. H616

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3. POPULATION; COMMISSION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 15165, to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. p. H616

4. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch (H. Rept. 91-823). ~~p. H616~~

5. LOANS; INDIANS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee approved for full committee action S. 227 amended, to provide for loans to Indian tribes and Indian Corporations. p. D60

6. WEATHER. Rep. Fascell announced that the President has proclaimed February as U.S. Weather Service Month. p. H611

7. POLLUTION; BUDGET. Rep. Gibbons inserted an article, "Nixon In Reversal, To Use Full $800 Million Voted By Congress For Sewage-Plant Aid." p. H612

8. ECONOMIC REPORT. Rep. Patman criticized the economic report. pp. H612-3

9. FORESTS; TIMBER YIELD. Rep. Saylor inserted a telegram from conservationists opposing H. R. 12025, the proposed National Timber Supply bill. pp. H614-5

10. PEACE CORPS. Received from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; to Foreign Affairs Committee.

SENATE

11. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 1072, continuing appropriations for Labor-HEW and related agencies for 1970. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. S1049

12. AIRPORTS. The Finance Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 14465, to provide for Federal assistance for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airports and airways system. p. D58

13. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Ellender inserted a list of public works funds held in budgetary reserve. pp. S1049-53

14. POLLUTION; ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Magnuson inserted the anti-pollution resolution of the Wash. State Senate urging Congress to continue to foster methods of combating this serious national problem. pp. S1048-9

Sen. Jackson commented on the nominations to the Council on Environmental Quality and gave notice of hearing on the nominations. p. S1062

Sen. Moss inserted an article, "A National Need: An Environmental Ethic." pp. S1073-6

15. GRAZING FEES. Sen. Anderson expressed his disappointment with the decision not to increase grazing fees in 1970. pp. S1071-2

91st Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
2d Session } { No. 91-823

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1970

February 3, 1970.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Hanley, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 13008]

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 13008) to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1969" and insert in lieu thereof "1970";

Page 3, line 19, immediately before the semicolon insert a comma and the words "to the greatest extent practicable";

Page 6, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The first amendment is a technical amendment changing the title of the act to "The Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970."

The second amendment gives flexibility to the Commission in recommending necessary exemptions to the coordinated plan envisaged by the act. As originally written, H.R. 13008 appeared to require a coordinated plan without exemptions. The committee felt that some exemptions may be desirable, though they should be fully justified in the Commission's final report.

The third amendment requires that the Commission report monthly, or as otherwise directed, to the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees. The intent is to provide these committees with the information necessary to assure the Congress that the development of the recommendations required by H.R. 13008 is carried on in a completely objective manner by the Civil Service Commission.

PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this bill to provide the general framework for the reform of position classification systems throughout the executive branch of the Federal Government. The bill does not change existing classification laws, but establishes the basic guidelines within which the Civil Service Commission shall prepare legislation to be presented to Congress in the future.

H.R. 13008 establishes the intent of Congress that, to the greatest extent possible, there should be a coordinated classification plan applicable to all positions in the executive branch, utilizing various methods of position classification, under the general supervision of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission is given the authority to study all executive branch classification systems, including those not currently under its jurisdiction. The plan will be developed by a separate unit within the Commission and responsible directly to the Commissioners. Provisions are made for effective consultation with Congress, departments and agencies, employee unions, and professional organizations throughout the development of the plan. H.R. 13008 requires that the Commission report to Congress within 2 years after date of enactment, after which the special unit will be abolished.

STATEMENT

General

Position classification is the keystone of sound personnel management. A good position classification program should be far more than a mechanism to set pay for various positions. Ideally, the process by which the duties and responsibilities of a position are determined, and the position is thereby assigned a relative value, should have an important role in such diverse functions as budgeting, manpower allocation, determination of recruitment and training needs, performance evaluation, and many others. Unfortunately, the position classification programs of many departments and agencies are being used almost solely as a pay-setting device.

Job classification is a complex matter which has serious implications both for departments and agencies which must organize work efficiently and to employees whose entire careers can hinge on the classification of their positions. While the public, and many Government officials, do not understand the intricacies of job classification, classification is nonetheless extremely important to the efficient use of a large percentage of our tax dollars.

The classification system which applies to the greatest number of Federal employees was devised more than 40 years ago. While this system has been expanded and improved considerably, major changes are needed so that it can better meet the needs of modern government.

The need for flexibility

In devising the plan mandated by this bill, the Civil Service Commission should carefully evaluate and analyze all methods of position classification. The resulting system, furthermore, should not rely on any one method, but should be so constructed as to utilize all appropriate methods which can then be coordinated with or linked to a general set of classification principles. It is emphatically not the intention of this legislation to force all Federal positions into one monolithic classification mold, but rather to build into a coordinated classification system the flexibility which the general schedule system has heretofore lacked.

No exemptions

H.R. 13008 exempts no agencies or occupational groups from its provisions. Many of the current exemptions to chapter 51 of title 5 date back to the passage of the original Classification Act of 1923. While these, and more recent exemptions, may have been perfectly justified when they were originally proposed, doubts have been expressed as to whether some exemptions should continue to exist even under the present general schedule classification system.

The committee has not taken a stand on which exemptions should be maintained and which are no longer justified. However, development of the new plan should include careful study of all existing exemptions. The report to be submitted to Congress within 2 years after date of enactment should contain the result of these studies as well as complete justification for any exemptions from the coordinated system which the Commission decides to recommend.

Complete objectivity imperative

During the course of the hearings on H.R. 13008, several employee organizations expressed some skepticism as to whether the Civil Service Commission would possess sufficient objectivity to competently carry out its responsibilities under the bill. The committee shares this concern, for on some occasions in the past, the Commission has been notably reluctant to recognize the need for change. The committee, however, feels that there is no practical alternative to lodging this responsibility within the Commission. Therefore, H.R. 13008 establishes an independent unit responsible directly to the Commissioners to develop the recommendations. This unit, it must be emphasized, should have no formal connection with any other bureau within the Commission, nor should there be even informal control or supervision by any other Commission bureau. The new unit should be staffed only by employees who should have no responsibilities other than those assigned by the Director of the unit, and every attempt should be made to draw as much of the staff as possible from outside the Civil Service Commission. It would also be preferable if the Director of the unit himself could be recruited from outside the Commission, and, if possible, from outside the Government. No resource, governmental or nongovernmental, should be overlooked.

In formulating its recommendations, the Commission should take great pains to involve all appropriate departments and agencies, employee unions, and professional organizations in every phase of the program. The Commission should, to the greatest extent possible, establish advisory groups consisting of representatives of departments and agencies to assist it in developing a mode of operation and formulating the plan itself.

Employee organizations

H.R. 13008, as amended, requires that the Civil Service Commission report monthly to the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees. The committee seriously considered the establishment of an advisory committee consisting of employee unions and professional organizations. However, the committee felt that a small, effective advisory committee would be too restrictive in membership, and a committee consisting of all appropriate organizations would be too unwieldy to be effective.

Therefore, the committee concluded that the most effective way to assure objectivity on the part of the Commission would be to require the Commission to file monthly progress reports with the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees which would be made available to all interested parties. This committee intends to use this provision as the foundation for monthly hearings on the progress of the Commission's activities. During the course of these regular hearings, all interested organizations would be invited to testify on the development of the Commission's recommendations, and this testimony would be made public. Thus, the House and Senate committees will, in essence, by the advisory group.

Nevertheless, as directed in section 304(d), the Commission is expected to frequently solicit the views of and consult with all appropriate employee organizations. A close working relationship with all employee and professional organizations is essential to the development of the recommendations required by H.R. 13008.

CONCLUSION

Changing the job evaluation and ranking systems of the Federal Government is a delicate and time-consuming task. It raises many questions and doubts in the minds of employees subject to the systems. It breaks patterns of thought and action with which personnel officials have become comfortable—perhaps too comfortable—over the past 47 years. Nevertheless, the task must be begun. H.R. 13008 represents the first legislative step toward much-needed and major reforms in the structure of and concepts behind job evaluation and ranking as it is utilized in the executive branch. The end result will hopefully be a system or systems which will provide greater cross-agency equity and will recognize the need for modern and flexible personnel management in the Federal Government today.

BACKGROUND

Origin of position classification by law

The first Classification Act, passed in 1923, was one of the most significant milestones in the history of Federal personnel management. The Classification Act of 1923 was the culmination of several years

of study by Congress and the executive branch into the chaotic and inconsistent classification and compensation practice extant in the Government at that time.

The catalyst in the move toward a more comprehensible and consistent system was the Congressional Joint Committee on Reclassification of Salaries established in 1919 by section 9, Public Law 65–314. The Commission was "to investigate the rates of compensation paid to civilian employees by the municipal government and the various executive departments and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia, except the Navy Yard and the postal service, and report by bill or otherwise as soon as practicable what reclassification and readjustment of compensation should be made so as to provide uniform and equitable pay for the same character of employment throughout the District of Columbia in the services enumerated."

The Classification Act of 1923

The Classification Act of 1923 established the basic principles upon which classification is based today: (1) That there should be equal pay for equal work, and (2) that the basic unit for classification and pay should be the position itself, rather than the incumbent of the position. The classification methods developed pursuant to this act are, essentially, the methods still used by the Civil Service Commission.

Originally, the 1923 act applied only to positions in Washington. However, subsequent to that, it was applied sporadically to some field installations. The Classification Act of 1949 provided that all positions subject to it would be treated in the same way whether in the District of Columbia or the field.

Exemptions from the Classification Acts

With the adoption of the Classification Act of 1923 and its subsequent amendments, the Congress and the executive branch extended the same ranking system to a majority of positions in the executive branch. However, at the time of an subsequent to the passage of the act, there were complaints from various departments and agencies that the Classification Act was too rigid, for certain groups of positions, to meet their personnel needs. Exemptions were made to provide more flexibility in assignments and pay for the complaining agencies, and separate ranking systems were authorized. Among the groups for which separate authorizations were provided are the postal field service, the Foreign Service, the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Except for the Classification Act (general schedule), the systems are administered by the agencies in which they exist, with no review by the Civil Service Commission. No effective provision has been made for assuring consistency among the various systems in evaluating and ranking positions.

Establishment of the Subcommittee on Position Classification

In 1967, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee established the Subcommittee on Position Classification chaired by the Honorable James M. Hanley of New York. The first activity of this subcommittee was to hold hearings on various bills affecting classification in the Postal Field Service. (See "Reclassification of Certain Positions in

the Postal Field Service," Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, serial No. 90–13).

While the hearings centered on the postal field service, it soon became clear that the subcommittee should conduct an extensive investigation of position classification throughout the Federal Government. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee authorized the investigation, which commenced early in 1968.

The "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government"

The study was completed and published early in 1969. (See "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government," H. Rep. No. 91–28.) It was the first such study conducted by Congress since the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923, and was the most comprehensive study conducted by any group since the enactment of the Classification Act of 1949.

In general, the study pinpointed serious dificiencies in three major areas of classification. (1) It was felt that the structure of the general schedule system was lacking the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of modern government. (2) The existence of a multitude of unrelated classification systems throughout the Federal Government resulted in significant and, in many cases, deletorious inconsistencies in the methods of selection and appointment, promotion, conditions of work, and pay of employees in comparable positions. (3) The administration of classification systems specifically and the conduct of personnel management generally needed to be significantly improved in all departments and agencies.

Hearings

Hearings began on H.R. 13008 on August 5, 1969, and were concluded on December 16, 1969. The Subcommittee on Position Classification heard testimony from 58 witnesses representing 34 employee unions, professional organizations, and departments and agencies. All witnesses agreed on the general intent of H.R. 13008, though there was some relatively minor disagreement on a few specific provisions of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 13008, AS AMENDED

Section 101: Outlines the major findings of the "Report of Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government."

Section 201: Establishes the sense of Congress that—

(1) The executive branch should operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable,

(2) Such a system should utilize a variety of job evaluation and ranking methods, and

(3) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

Section 301: Establishes a separate unit within the Civil Service Commission which shall report directly to the Commission and which shall prepare a comprehensive job evaluation and ranking plan for the executive branch. The section also outlines five elements which must be included in the plan.

Section 302: Requires that the Commission consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking in developing the plan.

Section 303: Authorizes the Commission to secure from any executive agency the information and suggestions necessary to develop the coordinated plan.

Section 304: (a) Requires that the Commission submit to the President and the Congress an interim report of its activities under the act within 1 year after date of enactment.

(b) Requires that the Commission shall complete its activities within 2 years after date of enactment. The Commission's recommendations, including a draft of proposed legislation, shall then be submitted to the President who shall submit the report and his own recommendations to the Congress.

(c) Requires that the Commission report monthly, or as otherwise directed, to the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

(d) Requires that the Commission periodically consult with appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) Provides that the organizational unit established by section 301 shall cease to exist upon submission of the Commission's report to Congress.

COST

This legislation will result in no increased cost to the Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. HANLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Position Classification, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will reply to the committee's request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 13008, a bill to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

The bill would authorize the Civil Service Commission to develop a comprehensive job evaluation plan for positions in the executive branch.

The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the views expressed in the report which the Civil Service Commission is submitting on H.R. 13008 and accordingly recommends its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1969.

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in further response to your request for the views of the U.S. Civil Service Commission on H.R. 13008, a bill to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

This bill directs the Civil Service Commission to prepare a comprehensive plan for a coordinated position classification system applicable to all civilian positions of the executive branch. The bill includes a statement of congressional policy as to characteristics of the job evaluation system that should be planned. It also directs all departments and agencies to cooperate fully with the Civil Service Commission, establishes a time schedule for completion of the project, and requires consultation with employee organizations during the preparation of the plan.

The Civil Service Commission favors enactment of H.R. 13008.

No significant updating of the general schedule system has been made since 1949. No substantial changes have been made in the basic structure of the postal field service system since its inception in 1955, although some revisions have been made to specific aspects of the system. No effort has been made to integrate other job evaluation plans in various individual agencies into a coordinated system applicable throughout the executive branch.

The report prepared last year by the Subcommittee on Position Classification revealed the need for adopting a coordinated plan covering all civilian positions. In addition, the Civil Service Commission is constantly confronted with numerous kinds of problems that arise directly from the existence of different systems in different agencies. Identical kinds of jobs are now given different job titles, placed in different grades, and are paid at different rates by different agencies. The processes of recruiting and examining applicants, promoting and transferring employees, evaluating employee experience, planning manpower needs, and even the more mundane task of preparing statistical reports, all are unnecessarily made more difficult by the lack of a coordinated job evaluation plan.

The Commission in general concurs in the objectives set forth in H.R. 13008 for a comprehensive, coordinated position evaluation plan. Meeting these objectives should result in a plan that will eliminate unnecessary discripancies in the evaluation of jobs from agency to agency. Changes in work technology, occupational characteristics, program needs, labor market conditions occur so frequently and are often of such significance that the coordinated plan should provide flexibility permitting the executive branch to make appropriate adjustments. The objectives leave room for the Civil Service Commission to devise evaluation methods within the coordinated system that will be appropriate for the individual needs of different occupations. Authority to supervise and control the system to be developed must be centralized if effective coordination is to be achieved and maintained.

For some time we have been planning ways and means for updating the various job evaluation plans currently used in the executive branch.

We have concluded that the task of developing a new plan must be assigned to a new unit to be established for this purpose in the Commission's Bureau of Policies and Standards. We plan to staff this new unit with a group of outstanding specialists both from within the Commission's regular staff and others recruited or borrowed for the project. The importance of this area is such that the Commission will keep in direct contact with the work of the group.

The assignment of authority to the Civil Service Commission to obtain information and suggestions from all agencies is highly desirable, particularly with respect to those current systems not now under the Commission's jurisdiction. The time schedule appears reasonable and appropriate. It should be feasible to complete the plan as scheduled if funding problems do not create unforeseen delays. The requirement that the plan be forwarded to the Congress by the President with his recommendations is essential.

In summary, the Commission welcomes the opportunity at this time to develop a coordinated job evaluation plan for the executive branch. It will be possible under H.R. 13008 to prepare a plan that will—

Result in all civilian positions of the executive branch being classified under a coordinated system;

Avoid unnecessary and unjustified differences among agencies in the evaluations of similar jobs;

Take advantage of the best current practice and knowledge in the field of job evaluation;

Give full consideration to the essential differences and needs of the various occupational categories;

Provide adequate flexibility so that the executive branch can make necessary adjustments in the system as conditions and needs change in the future;

Assure fairness and equity in the evaluation of the jobs of all civilian employees;

Facilitate other personnel and management functions.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON, *Chairman.*

Union Calendar No. 364

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

[Report No. 91–823]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 22, 1969

Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MESKILL) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

FEBRUARY 3, 1970

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of ~~1969~~ *1970*".

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the

country's needs during the past several decades has led to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no

significant study of, or experimentation with, the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, *to the greatest extent practicable*;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission

shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commission, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and which shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include, among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commission shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use and administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

~~(c) The Commission shall consult with the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives on a periodic basis as requested by those committees.~~

(c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this Act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with,

and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

Union Calendar No. 364

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

[Report No. 91–823]

A BILL

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HANLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MESKILL

JULY 22, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

FEBRUARY 3, 1970

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Feb. 16, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 19

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....8,33
Beekeepers.....16
Claims.....2
Environment 5,7,9,12,13,18
Farm program.....25
Feed grains.....20
Fish.....1,30,32
Foreign aid.....33
Forest.....10
Hunger.....22
Land claims.....27
Marketing.....23
Meat prices.....24
Nutrition.....22
Pamphlet.....11
Personnel.....3,26
Pesticides.....9
Pollution...5,7,9,12,13,18
Potatoes.....14
Quarantine station.....31
Reclamation.....28
Records.....4
Recreation.....15,19
Retirement.....26
Secretary.....5
Selective service.....21
Shipping.....29
Sugar beets.....6
Watersheds.....11
Wilderness.....10
Wildlife.....17

HIGHLIGHT; Rep. Mayne inserted Secretary Hardin's Des Moines speech on environmental quality.

HOUSE

1. FISH. Passed under suspension of the rules, H. R. 1049, to provide for the conservation and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish resources. pp. H815-20

2. CLAIMS. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 13582, to authorize the waiver of claims of the U. S. arising out of certain erroneous payments. pp. H824-7

3. JOB EVALUATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch. pp. H827-30

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

4. RECORDS. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 14300, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation. pp. H820-2

5. SECRETARY. Rep. Mayne inserted Secretary Hardin's speech before the National Farm Institute and said that "the Secretary gave a most impressive forecast of the ways in which the Department of Agriculture will play an important part in helping to wage the Nixon administration's war on pollution." pp. H832-3

6. SUGAR BEETS. Rep. Kyros replied to critics of the Maine sugar beet industry, stating that remarks against the industry were "distorted, inaccurate, and a disservice to the individuals who have been involved in this project." pp. H833-4

7. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. Rep. Crane said every American concerned with the quality of life in this Nation can help to halt the destruction of our natural resources. pp. H851-2

8. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 15931, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970 (H. Rept.91-840). p. H861

SENATE

9. PESTICIDES. Sen. Hart referred to a magazine article which describes the "potentially disastrous consequences to the environment and to man himself" from the use of Pesticide 2, 4, 5, -T, and he inserted letter asking certain witnesses to appear before hearings set for March 11, 1970 to consider effects of pesticides on man and his environment. pp. S1668-9

10. WILDERNESS; FOREST. Sen. Yarborough inserted a Dallas Garden Club resolution endorsing the creation of the Big Thicket National Park. p. S1667

11. WATERSHED; PAMPHLET. Sen. Griffin complimented this Department's brochure, "Let's Grow!" as a pictorial sampling of the variety of benefits resulting from the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. pp. S1684-5

12. POLLUTION. Sen. Proxmire asked support for his proposed bill which would set up schedule of effluent charges, and thereby provide industry with an incentive to control its own waste at the source. pp. S1687-90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

13. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. Rep. Mollohan said that the concern over ecology and its relation to pollution problems is predicted by many to be the issure of the 1970's. p. E920

Rep. Shipley inserted an address, "Pollution and 1970." pp. E926-9

14. POTATOES. Rep. Leggett spoke in support of S. 2214, to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing agreements and orders. p. E929

15. RECREATION. Rep. Leggett favored immediate passage of legislation to provide for the acquisition of land for the Point Reyes National Seashore. p. E937

16. BEEKEEPERS. Rep. Rhodes discussed the alleged plight of Ariz. beekeepers and said he was "strongly critical" of this Department's position on this problem. pp. E944-7

Secertaries for overpayments to civilian employees.

Its function is to make the law uniform for both civilian employees who are now coverd and for the uniformed services and for the National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will pass the bill, H.R. 13582.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Yes, I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the bill, as I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE) said, is retroactive; or is it prospective?

Mr. SMITH of New York. If the gentleman will bear with me here for just a moment, this bill will permit a period in which a waiver may be made of 3 years from the discovery of the erroneous payment or 3 years from the date of enactment of the amendment authorizing the waiver. So it will be retroactive only to the extent that any overpayment which has been made prior to 3 years from the enactment of the statute may be treated under the statute.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, so it is retroactive for a period of 3 years; is that correct? I am wondering why the bill was not made prospective instead of retroactive. I wonder if the records in some cases are available on a retroactive basis?

Mr. SMITH of New York. If the gentleman will bear with me, I understand that the purpose was to make it parallel with the present waiver of the statute covering civilian employees.

Mr. GROSS. And retroactivity is to be found in the statute covering civilian employees?

Mr. SMITH of New York. That is the present law covering civilian employees.

Mr. GROSS. Now did the committee incorporate the language that was suggested by the General Accounting Office; and if not, why not?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the committee did use the language suggested by the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office wanted to except allowances for travel and transportation, for the reason that these were in the nature of a one-shot allowance, and the person who was overpaid on a travel or transportation allowance should know that he was overpaid at that time. Therefore, a requirement to have him pay it back has not been waived. So the committee did adopt the language requested by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. GROSS. I believe that there is justification for this legislation since legislation has been enacted with respect to civilian employees. But will the gentleman not agree with me that even with the adoption of this legislation, which only supplements that which was previously passed, that we are still not getting at the root of the evil of overpayment, and frankly, I do not know how can we get at it—to hold someone responsible for the altogether too many costly mistakes that are being made throughout the Government.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I will agree with the gentleman that perhaps there are too many such errors made. It would seem to me, however, that if the authority for waiver up to $500 is given to the Secretary concerned in these cases then, as an administrative matter, it would seem the Secretary concerned would be able to tighten up the operation in his department if there were too many of these overpayments.

Mr. GROSS. Let us hope that will be the result, but I do not see much of a diminution in number of claims bills as a result of the administrative settlement that has been provided the civilian branch of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would thank the gentleman for helping to make the legislative record in this regard, because I think all of us here in the House are interested in having this sort of thing tightened up.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. I hope it has the effect of tightening up the administrative procedure so that we will see fewer and fewer of these overpayments showing up on the Private Calendar. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is an event when an adjustment for an underpayment is sought. They are all overpayments, or practically all of them. I cannot recall in many, many months, if not years, where a mistake was made in underpaying an employee. The mistakes are overpayments.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Those are probably self-correcting. The employee who is underpaid knows very quickly when he is underpaid.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13582, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1970

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13008) to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13008

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970".

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the country's needs during the past several decades has led to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no significant study of, or experimentation with, the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commisison, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and wihch shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establisment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include, among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commision shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use

and administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committes, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this Act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with, and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13008 states that it is the sense of Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, the executive branch shall operate under a coordinated classification plan, utilizing several methods of classification. The coordinated plan would be under the general supervision of the Civil Service Commission.

The bill establishes a separate unit within the Commission responsible only to the Commissioners. This unit will be responsible for developing the Commission's recommendations, and will cease to exist upon submission of these recommendations.

The independence of this unit from any other bureau within the Commission is considered essential to the objectivity required by this project.

Other mechanisms have been built into H.R. 13008 to assure that all relevant points of view are given due weight. The Commission is required to consult frequently with employee and professional organizations whose members may be affected by the new system.

We feel that this is extremely important, because no good classification program can be fully effective without the support and understanding of the employees under that program.

The bill also requires that the Commission provide the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees with monthly progress reports. We on the House side intend to use these reports in a continuing program of legislative oversight, including hearings, if necessary.

Finally, the bill requires that the Commission submit its final report along with legislative recommendations to the President and to the Congress within 2 years after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes no change in existing law. It abolishes no classification system currently exempt from the provisions of the Classification Act. Therefore, the bill exempts no executive branch agency from its provisions. Over the years more than 50 classification systems have been exempted from the provisions of that act. Some of these exemptions may still be justified, but many of them could be profitably brought under a coordinated plan. We have taken no stand on which exemptions should be allowed to stand, but we do feel that the Commission should have complete latitude to study all systems in preparation of its recommendations.

The support which H.R. 13008 has received has certainly been most gratifying. It was sponsored by all the members of the Subcommittee on Position Classification; it has been endorsed by the Civil Service Commission as well as the Bureau of the Budget, and it was ordered reported unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During our extensive hearings on the bill, all witnesses endorsed its underlying concepts.

Position classification is a highly complex matter which is little understood outside the personnel management fraternity. Yet the methods by which jobs are evaluated and ranked can have an enormous impact on the expenditures of our tax dollars. Poor or inconsistent classification administration is wasteful, not only because some jobs may be paid more or less than they are worth, but also because it can lead to the improper allocation of manpower.

Because of the extreme complexity of the subject matter, Congress has generally been reluctant to become deeply involved in studies and investigations of classification systems. For the past 47 years, we have been content to establish some broad guidelines, and leave the administration of the systems, thus established, to the executive branch. The original Classification Act, enacted in 1923, was the result of the studies conducted by the Congressional Joint Committee on Reclassification of Salaries. From that time until 1968, Congress conducted no full-scale study of the administration of or the principles underlying position classification as it is practiced in the Federal Government.

In 1968, the Subcommittee on Position Classification embarked on a major study of position classification systems. The results of this study were printed early in 1969 in the House report entitled "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government." This report is, to my knowledge, the most extensive investigation of Federal position classification systems ever published.

The report presented 31 major findings and made 11 specific recommendations. The findings pinpointed major problems in three basic areas:

First. The lack of flexibility in the general schedule system which made that system inadequate to meet the needs of modern personnel management;

Second. The existence of a multitude of relatively unrelated classification systems leading to a number of unwarranted inconsistencies among those systems; and

Third. Unevenness in the administration of classification systems throughout the Federal Government.

Further, interestingly enough, the findings and recommendations of this report closely paralleled less comprehensive studies conducted years ago by the two Hoover Commissions and the Interdepartmental Committee on Civilian Compensation. The recommendations on classification reform of these eminent groups, however, were never acted upon.

The subcommittee wanted to make sure that this experience was not duplicated. Therefore, we drafted H.R. 13008, which requires the Civil Service Commission to submit to Congress in legislative form a complete plan for reform of executive branch classification systems.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will see fit to approve this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes, is a good and important piece of legislation. It should be approved.

The reasons for its adoption are many, but I would like for my colleagues to consider just a few.

First. Today, the Federal Government operates under an estimated 50 different classification systems.

Second. There is no consistency under the present systems because all departments and agencies in the executive branch administer their own system, with no review by the Civil Service Commission.

Third. The structure of the General Schedule system is lacking in flexibility to meet needs of a modern government.

This results in an inconsistent and unfair way to treat our most important resource; our Federal employees.

So, we propose in this legislation that the Civil Service Commission, with advice from labor and professional organizations, and appropriate agencies and departments, conduct a thorough study into this subject and report back to the Congress in 2 years with a legislative proposal.

During the study, the Commission will be required to issue monthly reports on its progress. Our Post Office and Civil Service Committee expects to hold public hearings on the development of this report and invite all interested parties to testify.

That is all this bill does. It gives us a chance to have a fair classification system developed to meet our present and future needs. A system that affords equal pay for equal work throughout the Federal Government.

I am hopeful my colleagues will approve this legislation, for I believe, a sound classification system is as fundamental to our Federal Government structure as railroad tracks are to a railroad company.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

(Mr. MESKILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch and for other purposes.

This is good, sound legislation which provides a first necessary step to modernize our Federal job evaluation system. A step we cannot afford not to take.

This legislation proposes to mandate the Civil Service Commission to develop a fair and uniform classification system. In other words, a coordinated plan to award equal pay for equal work regardless of location or agency. The Commission in preparing its report should consult with labor unions, professional organizations, and other parties of interest.

During the preparation of this study, the Commission will submit monthly progress reports to the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees. This provision will allow our committee an opportunity to review the recommendations in public hearings.

The Commission will then submit a final legislative proposal to the Congress, within 2 years.

In closing, let me repeat, this is a good bill. It should be approved.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

(Mr. McCLURE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13008, which I cosponsored, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch and for other purposes.

It is a good piece of legislation and deserves our approval.

For nearly 3 long years now, the Subcommittee on Position Classification has been considering this subject. This bill has now been unanimously reported from our subcommittee and full Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am hopeful my colleagues will do likewise today.

This legislation proposes to do one important thing; that is, to reform our Federal classification systems. It intends to do this by authorizing the Civil Service Commission to conduct a thorough review and study of this subject. In all phases of this program, the Commission should consult and involve employee unions, professional organizations, all departments and agencies of the Government, and other interested parties.

Also, the Commission will report monthly to the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees on its progress. Our committee intends to take this opportunity to hold public hearings and invite all interested parties to testify.

At the conclusion of this study, and within 2 years, the Commission will submit a final legislative proposal to the Congress.

Since the Congress is already on record in support of a comparable wage for our Federal employees, I ask you to consider the words of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Bob Hampton, who testified before our subcommittee:

> We need to look for a better job evaluation system, because if we're going to pay a comparable wage then it should truly be comparable.

In closing, I strongly urge support of this needed legislation.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN).

Mr. TIERNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13008 is an important bill which could ultimately have a great impact on personnel management throughout the Federal Government. The recommendations which will come to us as a result of this legislation will represent the first major overhaul of our classification systems since the passage of the Classification Act of 1949. H.R. 13008 is the necessary first step in this important job of reform.

As pointed out in our "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government," a major problem in consistency across agency lines has arisen because of the existence of a multitude of unrelated classification systems which are exempt from the provisions of the Classification Act. To put it bluntly, we have not always lived up to the ideal of "equal pay for equal work."

An important provision of H.R. 13008 grants the Civil Service Commission the authority to study and make recommendations concerning those classification systems which are not under its jurisdiction. We anticipate that many of these systems can be consolidated under a flexible, coordinated plan. Even should the Civil Service Commission recommend the continuation of some exemptions, H.R. 13008 will have performed a valuable service by having fostered a fresh and independent review of all classification systems in the executive branch.

To cite just one example, I have long been interested in the personnel management program of the Foreign Service. Every indication points to the great need for a serious and objective reappraisal of all of the concepts underlying the personnel system of the Foreign Service.

We are told that a rank-in-the-man system is essential for flexibility in assignment. Yet the Department of Defense has many more positions abroad than the Foreign Service, and these positions are classified under the general schedule. The Department of Defense has no complaints, why should the Foreign Service?

We are told that selection-out is necessary for orderly promotions. Yet, this mechanism has caused the dismissal of countless qualified and useful specialists because it was claimed they did not have the "potential" to rise to the Olympian heights of career minister or ambassador.

We have been assured that evaluation of an officer's performance is completely objective. Yet, no position description exists against which an officer's performance can be measured.

We have been supplied with information attesting to the "objectivity" of the Foreign Service selection process. Yet, there is still a notable lack of minority group representation within its ranks.

In short, there appears to be a notable gap between what we are told and reality.

Many of the personnel problems in the Foreign Service cannot be attributed to its classification program or, more accurately, its lack of a classification program. To the extent that they are, however, H.R. 13008 will perform a valuable function.

I look forward with anticipation to the results of the intensive investigation of classification and ranking within the Foreign Service, as well as the other systems within the executive branch which are exempt from the Classification Act. If we can take one step toward order out of the relative chaos which now exists, our efforts here will be rewarded.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shrongly recommend that the House pass H.R. 13008.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13008 was developed in our Subcommittee on Position Classification. It is part of that subcommittee's efforts to foster reform and modernization of the position classification systems used throughout the executive branch.

During the 3 years of its existence, the subcommittee has performed a great service to the Congress and the public. Its "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government," issued last year, is the result of more than a year of intensive study. It is considered one of the best reports on the subject ever published.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on H.R. 13008. All told, there were 58 witnesses representing 34 employee organizations, departments, and agencies. All of these witnesses agreed on the general purpose of the bill. H.R. 13008 has also been endorsed by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Position Classification and its chairman, JIM HANLEY, are to be highly commended. They have worked hard and well on a difficult subject. We are all very hopeful that H.R. 13008 will be the means by which much-needed reforms are eventually put into effect. I, therefore, heartily endorse the bill and urge all of my colleagues to give it favorable consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, position classification is one of the keystones of modern personnel management. The process by which we describe the duties and responsibilities of a job and determine its relative value has important implications in such diverse areas as budgeting, manpower allocation, recruitment, training, organizational structure, and pay.

One of the major findings of our subcommittee's report on job evaluation and ranking was that classification in most departments and agencies was not being utilized fully as a management tool. The reasons for this failure are many and complex, and we need not go into them today. Our study made it clear, however, that the time has come to insist on a rethinking of the concepts underlying our Federal classification systems.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the tenor and tempo of Government are quite different today than they were in 1923 when the first Classification Act was passed. In 1923, the functions of Government were limited and Government jobs, on the while, were relatively easy to categorize.

Today, the Federal Government is intimately involved in all aspects of the social, economic, and scientific life of this country. We now hire countless thousands of specialists whose occupations did not even exist in 1923. It is relatively easy to rank a clerk-typist's position according to duties and responsibilities, but how can we use these same principles to classify a microbiologist, a specialist in high-energy physics, or a teacher whose duties and responsibilities do not fit into neat little cubbyholes.

Although the function of Government has changed radically in the past four decades, it is surprising that no full-scale effort has been made to revise the fundamental concepts of position classification. We are still, to a great extent, operating within the framework established by the 1923 act. And we are still laboring under the assumption that exemptions from the act which were approved 20, 30, or 40 years ago are still justified today.

It is high time that we require a complete reassessment. In 1968, the subcommittee conducted a far-ranging study which pinpointed the major deficiencies. In H.R. 13008 we are taking another step by requiring that the experts take a good, searching look at all of the systems and make specific recommendations. The administration agrees with us, as both the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have endorsed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13008 is a good bill, and I am confident that the House and Senate will approve it.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13008, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 13008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 835) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 835

Resolved, That Wiley Mayne of Iowa be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNTIL YABLONSKI MURDERS ARE SOLVED, THERE WILL BE NO PEACE IN THE COAL FIELDS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks have passed since Joseph A. Yablonski, his wife, and his daughter were brutally murdered as they peacefully slept in their Clarksville, Pa., home. It was a crime which shocked the Nation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has done a remarkable preliminary job in tracking down the criminals and a grand jury in Cleveland has returned four murder indictments, yet those who paid for and contracted for this dastardly crime still remain at large.

I have contended from the start that UMWA President W. A. Boyle and the top officials of the United Mine Workers Union neither directed nor condoned these murders even though the indictments themselves charge a conspiracy to prevent Mr. Yablonski from testifying before a grand jury concerning illegal activities within the union. When the murders were discovered, I telegraphed Mr. Boyle urging that UMWA offer a $100,000 reward to find the killers. A few days later, the union put up $50,000, but beyond that has done little or nothing to help solve this crime.

If this terrible crime had resulted in the deaths of Mr. Titler, Mr. Carey, or any of the top officers of the UMWA, there would have been a relentless manhunt directed throughout all the districts and locals of the United Mine Workers. Mr. Boyle should immediately order every district and local UMWA official to put top priority on running down every possible lead which may help to solve this crime which has rocked the union and the Nation.

Mr. Boyle need have no fear, if indeed he is correct that the crime is not union connected. Those who now contend that Mr. Yablonski had many enemies should immediately mobilize every man in the union to find out which enemy is responsible for this dastardly crime.

But instead Mr. Boyle has spent more time and effort impugning the character of a dead man who cannot respond than he has in helping to solve the crime.

Last Thursday Mr. Boyle issued a press release which contended:

> There has been no press investigation of significance regarding the background of Joseph Yablonski. Yet Yablonski had questionable associations and political connections which merit journalistic investigation.

If Mr. Boyle has any specific information, let him now come forward with it on this point instead of maligning the character of a dead man.

There will be no peace in the coal fields, and the coal miners will not rest, until those who paid for and contracted for this crime are brought to justice.

ROGERS INTRODUCES COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES ACT OF 1970

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Act of 1970 which would amend and extend for 3 years the present partnership for health law which began with Public Law 89–749 and was amended by Public Law 90–174. The present law expires on June 30, 1970.

The bill that I am introducing would authorize a total of $787.5 million over a 3-year period, ending June 30, 1973. This money would provide for the continuation of grants to the States for comprehensive State Health planning; project grants for areawide health planning and for training, studies, and demonstrations. In addition, the grant programs for comprehensive public health services and project grants for health services development would be continued.

This bill would provide for a closer coordination between the 314(a) State planning agencies and the regional med-

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 17, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

AN ACT

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970".

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the

country's needs during the past several decades has led to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no

significant study of, or experimentation with, the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission

shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commission, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and which shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include, among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commission shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use and administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this Act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with,

and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

Passed the House of Representatives February 16, 1970.

Attest: W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

AN ACT

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 17, 1970
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Mar. 2, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 30

CONTENTS

Budget.....6
Daylight time.....16
Environment.....2
Expenditures.....6
Farm program.....14
Food-aid.....11
Foreign trade.....3
Grazing fees.....12
Hunger.....11
Inflation.....8
Legislation.....4
Manpower.....7
Nutrition.....2,11
Personnel.....1,7
Pesticides.....17
Pesticides.....10
Pollution.....2,15
Population.....2
Recession.....8
River basin.....5
Rural-urban affairs.....2
Saline water.....5
Small business.....15
Surplus commodities.....9
Waste products.....13,15

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Findley praised USDA's making available Tex. food aid programs. Rep. Springer noted "uphill fight" faced in getting farm bill. Sen. Mansfield discussed rural-urban population balance. Rep. Koch urged restricting use of DDT.

SENATE

1. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch (S. Report No. 91-713). ~~p. S2736~~

2. RURAL-URBAN AFFAIRS. Sen. Mansfield expressed his concern "about the distribution of our population as between the rural areas and the urban areas", and inserted a series of speeches and radio-TV addresses on the subjects of over-population, pollution and nutrition. pp. S2722-6

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Fannin listed instances of loss of employment in this country due to imports. pp. S2717-21

4. LEGISLATION. Sen. Byrd (W. Va.) listed the legislative accomplishments of the second session, 91st Congress. p. S2789

HOUSE

5. RIVER BASIN; SALINE WATER. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported H. R. 15689, to increase the authorization for appropriations for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin (H. Rept. No. 91-857); and H. R. 15700, to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program (H. Rept. No. 91-858). p. H1398

6. EXPENDITURES; BUDGET. Rep. Edwards, Ala., praised the President's proposed elimination of certain Federal programs. p. H1384

7. MANPOWER. Rep. Pucinski favored the establishment of a National Manpower Advisory Council and outlined four major responsibilities of the Council. pp. H1392-3

8. INFLATION; RECESSION. Rep. Albert criticized the Administration's economic policies and said that "They have produced both unprecedented inflation and a recession." pp. H1396-7

9. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received from this Department the annual report covering orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corp. and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities; to Agriculture Committee. p. H1398

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

10. PESTICIDES. Rep. Nichols said that many good arguments could be made both for and against the use of pesticides, and inserted an article, "Agriculture Has Big Sta' In Crackdown on Pesticides." p. E1484

Rep. Koch urged restrictions in use of DDT and inserted a letter to this Department. p. E1488

11. FOOD-AID. Rep. Findley commended this Department for adopting a goal of getting food-aid programs underway in all counties of the Nation by June 1970, and inserted letters regarding the Tex. court order on such programs. pp. E1489-91

12. GRAZING FEES. Rep. Dingell inserted an article commenting on Interior Secretary Hickel's "incredible" decision on grazing fees. p. E1491

13. WASTE PRODUCTS. Rep. Burton an article describing how a new conversion process is turning waste into cattle feed. pp. E1507-8

14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Springer said the "House Agriculture Committee is working hard to bring forth a farm bill...and has shown a determination that we will get a bill and pass it in plenty of time for the President to sign it before June 30 of this year." pp. E1508-9

Calendar No. 707

91st Congress
2d Session

SENATE

Report
No. 91–713

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1970

March 2, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McGee, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 13008]

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 13008) to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

The committee's monitoring of the organization of the Federal service, its specific inquiries into the subject, and its correspondence indicate the need for an inquiry into the current system of job evaluation and ranking as called for by H.R. 13008.

H.R. 13008 s reported by the House of Representatives does not in any way alter existing classification laws. It establishes an orderly procedure for the study of ways to improve current classification with a view to the establishment of a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking. The bill provides for the appointment by the Civil Service Commission of a special organizational unit within the Commission to prepare the plan.

The House report emphasizes that there should be no control over or supervision of the unit by any Commission bureau and that the new unit should be staffed only by employees who are totally freed of other duties. This committee agrees. Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton has advised the committee that, if the bill is enacted, the study unit will be established for administrative and support purposes within the Commission's Bureau of Policies and Standards but shall report directly to the three Commissioners, in accordance with the requirements of the bill.

The Senate committee is in accord with the House amendment which requires that "The Commission shall submit to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this act, together with the then current findings of the Commission." The intent of this amendment, in which the Senate committee concurs, is to provide for a free flow of progress information through the two committees to employee unions, professional organizations, and other interested groups.

The bill provides that within a year of the date of enactment, the Commission shall submit an interim report to the President and the Congress; and that within 2 years the Commission shall complete its functions and send a report, including its draft of proposed legislation, to the President. The President shall send the report, the proposed legislation and any recommendations he deems appropriate to the Congress.

The committee agrees with the provision of H.R. 13008 exempting no agency or occupational group from the study provided for, but makes no prejudgment whatsoever of any inclusions or exclusions or any other recommendations which the Civil Service Commission may make.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 101 states the findings of Congress on the need for a study of job evaluation and ranking in the executive branch. These findings are based upon the "Report on Job Evaluation and Ranking in the Federal Government" completed in 1969 by a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee chaired by the Honorable James M. Hanley of New York.

Section 201 states the sense of Congress that—

> (1) The executive branch should operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable.
>
> (2) Such a system should utilize a variety of job evaluation and ranking methods, and
>
> (3) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

Section 301 establishes a separate unit within the Civil Service Commission to report directly to the Commission and to prepare a job evaluation and ranking plan.

Section 302 requires that the Commission consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking in developing the plan.

Section 303 authorizes the Commission to secure from any executive agency the information and suggestions necessary to develop the coordinated plan.

Section 304(*a*) requires that the Commission submit to the President and the Congress an interim report of its activities under the act within 1 year after date of enactment; (*b*) requires that the Commission shall complete its activities within 2 years after date of enactment.

The Commission's recommendations, including a draft of proposed legislation, shall then be submitted to the President who shall submit the report and his own recommendations to the Congress; (*c*) requires that the Commission report monthly, or as otherwise directed, to the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees; (*d*) requires that the Commission periodically consult with appropriate employee and professional organizations; (*e*) provides that the organizational unit established by section 301 shall cease to exist upon submission of the Commission's report to the Congress.

COST

This legislation will result in no increased cost to the Government.

O

Calendar No. 707

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

[Report No. 91–713]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 17, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

MARCH 2, 1970

Reported by Mr. MCGEE, without amendment

AN ACT

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970".

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the country's needs during the past several decades has led

to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no significant study of, or experimentation with, the several

recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission

shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commission, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and which shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commission shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use, and

administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Presi-

dent and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this Act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with,

and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

Passed the House of Representatives February 16, 1970.

Attest: W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 707

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13008

[Report No. 91–713]

AN ACT

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 17, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

MARCH 2, 1970

Reported without amendment

13. FARM LABOR; FOOD PROTECTION. Sen. Jordan announced that hearings would resume on S. 2203, the proposed Consumer Agricultural Food Protection Act, for two days, March 16, and 17, before the S. Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittee on Agricultural Research & General Legislation. p. S2968

14. ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION. Sen. Muskie commended and inserted the address of Gov. Mandel on the subject of pollution. pp. S2976-77

Sen. Yarborough inserted the report of Rep. Eckhardt, "Death of Galveston Bay", which details the virtual destruction of the oyster industry at Galveston due to pollution of the bay. pp. S2982-86

15. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment H. R. 13008, to improve position classification systems within the executive branch. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S2906-7

16. BUDGET. Sen. Inouye inserted a report which was submitted by the Truth-In-Budgeting Task Force which "provides much needed insight into the Nixon budget." pp. S2971-3

17. ALASKA CLAIMS. Sen. Harris commended the S. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and their leaders for considering legislation to settle the claims of the native people of Alaska. pp. S2974-6

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

18. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Hathaway called for support for construction of Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project. pp. E1605-5

19. GREAT PLAINS. Rep. Hall inserted a TV script "Survival on the Prairie", describing life on the Great Plains. pp. E1609-11

20. POLLUTION. Rep. Bush inserted a Labor Dept. news release "920 Polluted-Water Cleaners in Training in 20 States". pp. E1615-6

21. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schwengel inserted an article "Problem With Farm Programs: 'People Don't Understand Farm Plans' ". p. E1617

22. VOTING RECORD. Rep. Brown, Ohio, inserted a report to his constituents on legislation in the first session and his voting record including items of interest to this Department. pp. E1630-4

BILLS INTRODUCED

23. CLEAN AIR. S. 3546, by Sen. Muskie, et al, to amend the Clean Air Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works. Remarks of author pp. S2955-8

24. FLOOD CONTROL. S. 3547, by Sen. Allott, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Remarks of author pp. S2959-66

25. INSECT CONTROL. S. J. Res. 179, by Sen. Anderson, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out demonstration projects, using heat and light traps and other nonchemical means, to control insects harmful to agricultural crops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Remarks of author pp. S2966-7

26. WATER RESOURCES. H. R. 16279, by Rep. Burton of Utah; H. R. 16285, by Rep. Johnson of California, to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED BY THIS OFFICE

27. CONSUMERS; PRICES. S. 1494, proposed price discrimination legislation --1969. S. Judiciary Committee.
S. 2959, establish Independent Consumer Council. Part 1. S. Commerce.

28. CONFERENCE. H. Res. 523 and H. Res. 562, U. S. participation in 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment. H. Foreign Affairs.

29. RESEARCH; INFORMATION. Technology assesment. H. Science and Astronautics.

30. WILDLIFE. Migratory waterfowl regulations--1969-70. H. Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

31. WATERSHEDS. Watershed development plans--1969. H. Public Works Committee.

32. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. A foreign economic policy for the 1970's Part 1. Jt. Economic Committee.

33. ESTUARIES. The Nation's Estauries: San Francisco Bay and Delta Calif. Part 2 H. Gov't Operations.

34. AIR POLLUTION. Air pollution--1969. S. Public Works Committee.

35. DISASTER RELIEF. Ohio storm damage inspection. H. Public Works Committee.

36. SAFETY. H. R. 843, 3809, 4294, and 13373, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to set standards to assure safe and healthful working conditions. H. Education and Labor.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS: Mar. 5
Agricultural appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec); and S. Appropriations.
Feed grains section of farm bill, H. Agriculture (exec).
Interior appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).
Clean Air Act amendments and proposed Wastes Reclamation Act, H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
April 15: Herbicide 2-4-5-T, S. Commerce (Bayley and Byerly to testify).

oOo

Senate

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1970

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of History who hast brought us to this hour and to our appointed tasks, we offer Thee the love of our hearts and the service of our minds, our hands, our speech. Help us in all our work to be guided by Thy spirit for the welfare of all the people. Deliver us from the little evils which lay waste to life, shrivel the soul, and blemish character. Keep us from impatience and irritability. Give us inner serenity and outward assurance. Spare us stubbornness in self will but make us firm in adherence to Thy will. Amid the pressures, tensions, and struggles of the time, preserve in us the inner holy of holies, the silent sentinel of conscience, the serene sanctuary wherein Thy spirit dwells. When the evening comes, grant us the gift of sleep and knowledge we have walked and worked with Thee.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore. pore.

APPOINTMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 363) as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, pursuant to S. Res. 359 of the Ninety-first Congress: Mr. Roman L. Hruska; Mr. Jacob K. Javits; Mr. Peter H. Dominick; Mr. Edward W. Brooke; Mr. Mark O. Hatfield; and Mr. Marlow W. Cook.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 3, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, without losing his right to the floor or any of the time allotted to him?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, under those terms.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR EAGLETON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the prayer tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) be recognized for not to exceed 40 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HOLLINGS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, is is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), there be a period for the transaction of routine business, with the usual 3-minute limitation on statements made therein.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 705, 706, and 707.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the first bill by title.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN LAWS RELATING TO THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (S. 3396) to make certain technical changes in provisions of law relating to the postal service, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3396

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 308a is amended by striking out "the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (chapter 19 of title 5)," and inserting in lieu thereof "the requirements of sections 551 through 559 of title 5".

(2) Section 510 is amended by striking out "sections 366–380 of title 44" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 3301–3314 of title 44".

(3) Section 2103(a)(2) is amended by striking out "without regard to sections 630

630h of title 5," and "sections 391–401 of title 44,".

(4) Section 2303(a)(1)(H) is amended by striking out "section 302 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2192)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1472 of title 50".

(5) Section 2303(b) is amended by striking out "section 207(b) of the Act of February 28, 1925, relating to reformation of classification (39 U.S.C., 1958 ed. 247)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4558 of this title".

(6) Section 2306 is amended by striking out "2254(a) of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "8334(a) of title 5".

(7) Section 2403(d)(1) is amended by striking out "sections 134–134(h) of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 721–729 of title 40".

(8) Section 2506(b) is amended by striking out "section 58 of title 44" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 505 of title 44".

(9) Section 3103 is amended by striking out "section 16(a) of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2903(b) of title 5".

(10) Section 3313 is amended by striking out "sections 58, 62, 69, and 70 of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 5535(b)(1) and 5536 of title 5".

(11) Section 3334(a) is amended by striking out "chapter 17 of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3309 of title 5".

(12) Subsections (a) and (c) of section 3335 are respectively amended by striking out "sections 69 and 70 of title 5 and section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 5533, 5535(b)(1), and 5536 of title 5".

(13) Section 3336 is amended by striking out "chapter 16 of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5".

(14) Section 3573 is amended by—

(a) striking out "a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862; 5 U.S.C. 87b)," where it appears in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "a day established as a holiday by section 6103 of title 5"; and

(b) striking out "the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f)", where it appears in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 5582 of title 5".

(15) Section 4151 is amended by striking out "sections 162 and 185 of title 44" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 733 and 907 of title 44".

SEC. 2. The Act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 204, sec. 3, 47 Stat. 1482; 11 U.S.C. 101a), is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–711), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would make technical changes in the references to certain provisions of law codified in the United States Code. It makes no substantive changes in law.

Following is a letter from the Postmaster General relating to S. 3396.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1970.

Hon. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to make technical corrections in certain provisions of laws relating to the postal services. The first section makes changes in various provisions of title 39, United States Code, to conform to changes made by other laws which repealed and reenacted statutes cited in title 39.

The changes in sections 308a, 2303(a)(1)(H), 2306, 2403(d)(1), 3103, 3313, 3334(a), 3335(a) and (c), 3336, and 3573(c) and (f) became necessary by the recodification of title 5, United States Code, Public Law 89–554, September 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 378.

The changes in sections 510, 2506(b), and section 4151 became necessary by the recodification of title 44 of Public Law 90–620, October 22, 1968, 82 Stat. 1238.

The changes in section 2103(a)(2) became necessary as a result of the recodification of both title 5 and title 44.

The changes in section 2303(b) became necessary by the enactment of Public Law 89–593, section 1(a), September 20, 1966, 80 Stat. 816.

Section 2 would repeal a provision of law which has become obsolete in view of the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, to which it refers, pursuant to Public Law 89–377, March 28, 1966, 80 Stat. 92.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

WINTON M. BLOUNT.

USE OF PERSONAL CHECKS TO PAY POSTAL CHARGES

The bill (S. 3397) to permit the acceptance of checks and nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services; authorize the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and accountable officers for losses incurred by postal personnel when accepting checks or nonpostal money orders in full compliance with postal regulations; and to provide penalties for presenting bad checks and bad nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2403 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by:

(1) inserting ", other accountable officers," immediately after "postmasters" in the catchline and in the first sentence of subsection (b);

(2) inserting "other accountable officer" immediately after "postmaster" in each place where it appears in the first sentence of subsection (a);

(3) deleting "and" at the end of subsection (a)(4)(B);

(4) deleting the period at the end of subsection (a)(5)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(5) adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraph:

"(6) losses occasioned by the acceptance of checks or nonpostal money orders, in accordance with an authorization prescribed pursuant to section 2403a of this title, which are not duly paid."

SEC. 2. Chapter 29 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 2403, the following new section:

"§ 2403a. Payment by check on nonpostal money order

"(a) As used in this section 'draft' means a check or nonpostal money order.

"(b) In the performance of their official duties, employees of the Department may receive on behalf of the United States drafts in amounts which shall not exceed the sum to be paid or deposited for postal charges and services, under the conditions provided in an authorization prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(c) If a draft received is not duly paid, the person by whom or on whose behalf such draft has been tendered shall be liable to the United States, to the same extent as if such draft had not been tendered.

"(d) If any draft tendered in payment of any amount receivable is not duly paid, in addition to any other penalties provided by law, there shall be paid as a penalty by the person by whom or on whose behalf such draft was tendered, upon notice and demand by the Postmaster General or his delegate an amount equal to 5 per centum of the amount of such draft, except that if the amount of such draft is less than $100, the penalty under this section shall be $5 or the amount of such draft, whichever is the lesser. This subsection shall not apply if the person tendered or caused to be tendered the draft in good faith and with reasonable cause to believe that it would be duly paid."

SEC. 3. The table of contents of chapter 29 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out:

"2403. Adjustment of claims of postmasters and Armed Forces postal clerk."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"2403. Adjustment of claims of postmasters, other accountable officers, and Armed Forces postal clerks.

"2403a. Payments by check or nonpostal money order."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–712), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 3397 would relieve postal employees of personal financial liability for accepting personal checks from postal patrons in the course of business.

Under existing law, postal employees may not accept any check or nonpostal money order for the payment of postal costs without becoming personally liable for any loss incurred by the postal service. This severely limits the kind of currency generally used today to pay for postal money orders, c.o.d. charges, and other postal charges. The committee believes it is in the interest of improving the public service of the Post Office Department to authorize greater use of personal checks and nonpostal money orders.

Following is a letter from the Postmaster General requesting this legislation.

JOB EVALUATION POLICY ACT OF 1970

The bill (H.R. 13008) to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–713), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The committee's monitoring of the organization of the Federal service, its specific inquiries into the subject, and its correspon-

dence indicate the need for an inquiry into the current system of job evaluation and ranking as called for by H.R. 13008.

H.R. 13008 as reported by the House of Representatives does not in any way alter existing classification laws. It establishes an orderly procedure for the study of ways to improve current classification with a view to the establishment of a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking. The bill provides for the appointment by the Civil Service Commission of a special organizational unit within the Commission to prepare the plan.

The House report emphasizes that there should be no control over or supervision of the unit by any Commission bureau and that the new unit should be staffed only by employees who are totally freed of other duties. This committee agrees. Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton has advised the committee that, if the bill is enacted, the study unit will be established for administrative and support purposes within the Commission's Bureau of Policies and Standards but shall report directly to the three Commissioners, in accordance with the requirements of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for his usual courtesy, graciousness and understanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

DRIVE BY CERTAIN GIANT CORPORATE UTILITIES TO MONOPOLIZE AND COMPLETELY CONTROL ATOMIC POWER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter which should be of national concern.

It vitally affects the public interest and, more specifically, the consumers of the Nation and the environment in which we live.

It is a drive by certain giant corporate utilities to monopolize and completely control atomic power.

This nuclear gold rush for control of atomic power is further compounded by a struggle among the industrial giants—the oil, coal, and utility interests—for what in effect would be monopoly control over all electric power.

For more than 2 years the utility corporations have been steadfastly opposing legislation to provide reasonable regulatory controls under the Atomic Energy Act.

The legislation which they oppose would protect the environment and set up antitrust safeguards that would allow the small investor-owned utilities, municipal electric companies and rural electric cooperatives to share in the benefits of nuclear power.

The ultimate goal of the utilities is apparently to concentrate all electric generation in the hands of 12 to 15 corporations which would have complete understanding among themselves.

This scheme is part of a grand strategy underlying what is called "economy of scale," a slogan which is intended to justify monopoly.

It is similar to the "vertical integration" system which has put the control of the U.S. broiler industry, with the exception of the State of Georgia, in the hands of the large feed manufacturers.

It involves not only nuclear, fossil fuel, and conventional generating plants, but the proposed new fast breeder reactors which will develop their own fuel, and the multi-billion-dollar gaseous diffusion plants that produce enriched uranium used as fuel by commercial atomic plants.

Once competition by small utilities and public bodies has been eliminated, the few remaining giant utilities will be free to make rates and reduce service almost at will, and the consumers will be the ultimate losers.

I am making no idle statement.

It is a fact to those who will take the trouble to look into it.

Wherever public power projects have been established, the private utilities—the corporate utilities—have lowered their rates and increased their services.

Today there are 31 atomic plant applications representing 43 major power reactors under review.

In addition, there are 70 plants under construction or actually generating power and by June 30, 1971, this number will increase to 92.

By 1980 the AEC estimates that there will be 200 installed units capable of generating 150 million kilowatts.

The total investment in these plants, at today's prices, will be about $40 billion, with the annual investment rate reaching $5 billion annually by 1980.

The present capital investment in the plants built, under construction, and on order is almost $15 billion.

Equally important—and this should be emphasized—is the fact that more than $2.3 billion of Federal money was invested in the advance research that made atomic power reactors profitable.

This investment of public money was made by Congress in hopes of developing commercially feasible, competitive atomic power.

Therefore, the municipals, rural cooperatives, and small investor-owned utilities have an inalienable right to share in the benefits of nuclear power.

Mr. President, some of us saw this coming in 1966 and realized that strong steps would have to be taken by the Atomic Energy Commission under existing law to regulate this new atomic power industry.

We also noted that the Atomic Energy Act was deficient in some respects, but pending the updating of the law there is one clear avenue the AEC could take, under existing law, to protect the public interest.

On this point the law is clear and simple.

All the Commission has to do is to find that the reactors now being installed in atomic generating plants have practical value in a commercial sense.

Once this is done, the Commission may proceed to issue a commercial construction license, followed by a license to operate commercially when the plant has been built and is ready to go on the line.

The Commission, however, has up to now shut its eyes to the reality of commercial feasibility and has refused to make a finding of practical value.

In all fairness, I should say that the pressure exerted by proposed legislation now before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, has recently induced a start toward a change of policy.

The Commission has announced the first practical value rulemaking procedure will be started next June, but if the delays in action so far are any indication there will be 70 plants in operation or under construction before this finding is made.

In the meantime, every new plant is being licensed as a research project under the medical therapy section of the law.

This deliberate policy of delay is further compounded by the issuance of "research" licenses of 40 years' duration.

No legitimate research project would ever require a 40-year license yet most commercial atomic generating plants do have this latitude.

The failure of the AEC to make any practical value finding naturally pleases the utilities and their friends, because it leaves them free from antitrust regulation.

It should also be pointed out that once a plant gets the initial AEC construction license as a research operation, the utility executives go down the street to the Securities and Exchange Commission and obtain permission to sell stock on the basis of the profits they anticipate.

In other words, the utilities are successful in having their atomic plants defined as nonprofit "research" undertakings in order to evade the antitrust laws, and as "commercial" ventures when they want to sell stock and make profits.

Nothing could be sweeter for the utilities—or less in the public interest.

Early in 1967, when the nuclear gold rush was gaining momentum, I consulted some of the legal authorities in the power field about legislation to require the Atomic Energy Commission to protect municipal power companies, rural electric cooperatives and small investor-owned private utilities.

A bill amending the Atomic Energy Act was carefully drafted and introduced that same year with the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy as cosponsor.

Others who joined in cosponsorship were Senators ANDERSON, BYRD of West Virginia, CLARK, COOPER, JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and METCALF.

Senator Robert Kennedy and I offered this bill, S. 2564, in hopes of getting the Atomic Energy Act amended to prevent a monopoly situation that should not be tolerated.

It was also our hope that we could awaken the general public to a realization that legislative steps must be taken to prevent an unhealthy economic condition from developing.

In the spring of 1968 extensive hearings were held on this bill, which contained four basic requirements:

First. To protect the public health and safety;

Second. To protect and conserve natural resources;

Third. To prevent regional monopoly of electric generation and distribution;

Fourth. To insure an adequate supply of power in areas threatened by shortages.

S. 2564 was welcomed by responsible citizens who were becoming increasingly concerned about protecting our environment from air and thermal pollution, appropriate sitings for nuclear plants, and additional safeguards to assure the continued safety and reliability of nuclear power.

S. 2564 also gave new hope to the municipals, rural electric cooperatives and small private companies, for it was obvious they could not raise the many millions of dollars needed to build atomic plants on their own.

As we expected, our bill was vigorously opposed by the utilities, which had not the slightest intention of complying with the intent of this bill if it could be prevented.

If enacted, S. 2564 would subject them to antitrust control and give the public bodies their fair share of the power generation.

I did not expect this bill would be enacted in its original form, but during the hearings I said that it would serve its purpose if it stimulated a broad and sweeping review of Federal control over all electric generation, with specific amendments to the law to halt the growing nuclear monopoly and provide additional guidelines for environmental safety and reliability.

The bill proved to be landmark legislation because of the interest and concern that is now centered on these problems as to both the benefits and the dangers of atomic power production.

During the 1968 hearings on S. 2564 it became apparent for the first time that the Atomic Energy Commission is not qualified to regulate this new source of power.

Testimony clearly showed that:

First. The Commission is not responsible for the preservation of natural resources;

Second. It does not have the competence for antitrust regulation;

Third. It has no licensing authority concerning regional monopolies;

Fourth. It lacks jurisdiction over the thermal and esthetic effects of atomic power and can only act on matters affecting radiological health and safety, and the common defense and security;

Fifth. The Commission does not have the expertise to license plants commercially because of what one of the Commissioners termed "the complex economic and technical problems encountered in the operation of a utility system."

As the 1968 hearings progressed, it became obvious that the utilities and their friends would do everything in their power to block S. 2564.

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and I therefore introduced a new bill on July 17, 1968, considerably moderated from the original legislation.

Our measure, S. 3851, sought to put the atomic energy industry under the antitrust laws like other business enterprises.

The Joint Committee could not find time for hearings on the substitute bill in 1968, so it was reintroduced as S. 212 in January of 1969.

Early hearings were anticipated but did not materialize.

Last November the Joint Committee opened hearings on S. 212 and a new bill, H.R. 9647, submitted by the Commission to eliminate the practical value requirement and authorize prelicensing antitrust review.

These measures seem to have a very low priority and it is doubtful if the Joint Committee will even complete the hearings this year.

As in the 1968 hearings, the AEC admitted it lacks the competence needed for the economic regulation of nuclear powerplants.

The AEC witness flatly stated that the Federal Power Commission is better qualified to regulate atomic plants.

While the 1969 hearings are still incomplete, there have been several important side effects during this long waiting period.

First. The AEC held the first hearing ever conducted on the financial qualifications of a nuclear powerplant.

The hearing concerned the Vermont Yankee plant now under construction at Vernon, Vt.

I am proud to note, in this connection, that the two Vermont private utilities holding the majority of the stock in Vermont Yankee have agreed to allow our Vermont municipals and rural electric cooperatives to buy shares of stock in the company.

However, other New England utilities —perhaps I should say eastern New England utilities—in the Vermont Yankee combine meanwhile have been blocking some 40 Massachusetts municipals from participation, a situation I hope will change.

The financial qualifications hearings were, to put it mildly, disappointing.

The Massachusetts municipals did appear and press for antitrust relief, but the AEC legal staff gave them no encouragement.

The failure of the AEC lawyers to present evidence for or against Vermont Yankee provoked the hearing examiner to upbraid the AEC staff for not submitting a brief on antitrust.

It was obvious, from this hearing, that the Commission does not understand the antitrust implications of the nuclear power business.

Second. The Justice Department under President Nixon, in language recalling the trust-busting days of President Theodore Roosevelt, has taken a new policy line advocating preconstruction antitrust advice for any utility planning to build a nuclear plant.

In this way the public interest would truly be served, for both the giant company and the small municipal would know its rights well in advance of operation.

Third. In its formal report on S. 212, the Justice Department declared that "any nuclear power facility designed to produce electricity for wholesale or retail distribution is a commercial operation in fact."

Fourth. The Justice Department developed this basic definition in a detailed speech made by the Director of Policy Planning, Antitrust Division, last October 15.

In this speech the Department stated that all utilties, private and public, should have the benefits of nuclear power generation, including the right to buy power at the same prices paid by the owner-utilities, as well as a fair share of any pooling operations.

Fifth. On December 5, the U.S. circuit court of appeals, after an extraordinary hearing with nine justices presiding, issued a decision on the Vermont Yankee and Duke Power antitrust cases.

The nub of this decision was the unanimous opinion that licensees must return to the AEC for an operating license, and before the operating license is issued the Commission must determine if the plants are commercially feasible, and if so the Commission must consider any anticipatory antitrust impact.

In spite of this mounting evidence of the need for revision of the Atomic Energy Act in the public interest, there are disturbing indications that the utilities and their friends have no intention of complying with the opinion of the court.

The monopoly seeking utilities do not want antitrust regulation, which indicates quite clearly that antitrust regulation is needed.

I understand that if hearings are resumed on S. 212, an effort will be made to write additional utility benefits into the bill.

One of these changes would assure that the only recourse the independent companies would have to antitrust protection would come after a violation had occurred.

This, of course, would be no protection at all, for a small municipal or private company, once victimized by antitrust action on the part of a giant utility combine, is in no position to defend itself through years of litigation in court.

The small company would be wiped out financially before violation of the antitrust statutes could be proved.

Mr. President, atomic energy is clearly at the crossroads.

We would not have competitive atomic power today had it not been for the brilliant work of AEC scientists in close cooperation with American industry.

This cooperation developed remarkable new peacetime uses for atomic energy—in biology and medicine as well as industry.

Thanks to this cooperation, our Nation has achieved supremacy in the atomic field.

Then came competitive nuclear power and the AEC found itself suddenly thrown into a strange, new environment—the rugged American marketplace.

The atomic scientists were no longer in their cloistered laboratories at Oak Ridge and Argonne—they were in the mainstream of American competition and were not very good swimmers.

They developed a nuclear power technology that is safe and reliable by all responsible standards but they did not

Public Law 91-216
91st Congress, H. R. 13008
March 17, 1970

An Act

To improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970".

Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970.

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the tremendous growth required in the activities of the Federal Government in order to meet the country's needs during the past several decades has led to the need for employees in an ever-increasing and changing variety of occupations and professions, many of which did not exist when the basic principles of job evaluation and ranking were established by the Classification Act of 1923. The diverse and constantly changing nature of these occupations and professions requires that the Federal Government reassess its approach to job evaluation and ranking better to fulfill its role as an employer and assure efficient and economical administration;

63 Stat. 954, 972.
5 USC 5101 et seq and notes.

(2) the large number and variety of job evaluation and ranking systems in the executive branch have resulted in significant inequities in selection, promotion, and pay of employees in comparable positions among these systems;

(3) little effort has been made by Congress or the executive branch to consolidate or coordinate the various job evaluation and ranking systems, and there has been no progress toward the establishment of a coordinated system in which job evaluation and ranking, regardless of the methods used, is related to a unified set of principles providing coherence and equity throughout the executive branch;

84 STAT. 72
84 STAT. 73

(4) within the executive branch, there has been no significant study of, or experimentation with, the several recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking to determine which of those methods are most appropriate for use and application to meet the present and future needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) notwithstanding the recommendations resulting from the various studies conducted during the last twenty years, the Federal Government has not taken the initiative to implement those recommendations with respect to the job evaluation and ranking systems within the executive branch, with the result that such systems have not, in many cases, been adapted or administered to meet the rapidly changing needs of the Federal Government.

TITLE II—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 201. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the executive branch shall, in the interest of equity, efficiency, and good administration, operate under a coordinated job evaluation and ranking system for all civilian positions, to the greatest extent practicable;

(2) the system shall be designed so as to utilize such methods of job evaluation and ranking as are appropriate for use in the

executive branch, taking into account the various occupational categories of positions therein; and

(3) the United States Civil Service Commission shall be authorized to exercise general supervision and control over such a system.

TITLE III—PREPARATION OF A JOB EVALUATION AND RANKING PLAN BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Civil Service Commission, through such organizational unit which it shall establish within the Commission and which shall report directly to the Commission, shall prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of a coordinated system of job evaluation and ranking for civilian positions in the executive branch. The plan shall include, among other things—

(1) provision for the establishment of a method or methods for evaluating jobs and alining them by level;

(2) a time schedule for the conversion of existing job evaluation and ranking systems into the coordinated system;

(3) provision that the Civil Service Commission shall have general supervision of and control over the coordinated job evaluation and ranking system, including, if the Commission deems it appropriate, the authority to approve or disapprove the adoption, use and administration in the executive branch of the method or methods established under that system;

(4) provision for the establishment of procedures for the periodic review by the Civil Service Commission of the effectiveness of the method or methods adopted for use under the system; and

(5) provision for maintenance of the system to meet the changing needs of the executive branch in the future.

84 STAT. 73

84 STAT. 74

SEC. 302. In carrying out its functions under section 301 of this Act, the Commission shall consider all recognized methods of job evaluation and ranking.

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or any bureau, office, or part thereof, information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purposes of this Act; and each such executive agency or bureau, office, or part thereof is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Civil Service Commission upon request by the Commission.

80 Stat. 379.

SEC. 304. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim progress report on the current status and results of its activities under this Act, together with its current findings.

(b) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall complete its functions under this Act and shall transmit to the President a comprehensive report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations (including its draft of proposed legislation to carry out such recommendations), and

(2) the President shall transmit that report (including the recommendations and draft of proposed legislation of the Commission) to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the President deems appropriate.

Interim reports to Congress.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives once each calendar month, or at such other intervals as may be directed by those committees, or either of them, an interim progress report on the then current status and results of the activities of the Commission under this Act, together with the then current findings of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall periodically consult with, and solicit the views of, appropriate employee and professional organizations.

(e) The organizational unit established under section 301 of this Act shall cease to exist upon the submission of the report to the Congress under subsection (b) of this section.

Approved March 17, 1970.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 91-823 (Comm. on Post Office & Civil Service).
SENATE REPORT No. 91-713 (Comm. on Post Office & Civil Service).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 116 (1970):
Feb. 16: Considered and passed House.
Mar. 4: Considered and passed Senate.

GPO 37-139